

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview held on February 28, 2006 and for indicating that claims 15-18 and 36 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-36 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 15-18, 10, 22, and 36 are amended. No new matter is introduced. Claims 1 and 20 are amended to remove certain features in the preamble to the body of the claims. Claims 15-18 and 36 are rewritten in independent form. Claim 22 is amended to remove an informality. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the preceding amendments and following remarks.

Specification Objection

The specification is objected to. The specification has been amended to update the status of co-pending application. Withdrawal of the specification objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 22 is objected to because of an informality. Claim 22 is amended to remove the informality. Withdrawal of the claim objection is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1, 7-20, 23, 30-36 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 24 and 26-34 of co-pending application 10/821,845. A terminal disclaimer is filed herewith in order to place the application in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the double patenting rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-14, 19-30, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over United States Published Application 2003/0003872 to Brinkley et al. (hereafter Brinkley).

Brinkley is directed to a method for wirelessly communicating data between a plurality of avionics units on an aircraft and a data communication apparatus. Brinkley's method merely transmits data from an avionics unit to a ground station. Nowhere does Brinkley mention using a Personal Computer Memory Card International Association (PCMCIA) card that can be plugged into an Aircraft Condition Monitoring System (ACMS) to transmit the data. Specifically, Brinkley does not disclose or suggest "the PCMCIA card is capable of being plugged into an Aircraft Condition Monitoring System (ACMS) using an existing card interface, the ACMS generating an

ACMS report after one or more exclusive conditions are fulfilled,” as recited in amended claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to more precisely recite the novel features of the present invention. Furthermore, Brinkley does not disclose or suggest “the CPU wirelessly transmits the flight performance data stored in the memory to a ground station through the wireless network after the one or more exclusive conditions are fulfilled and the ACMS report is generated,” as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). Since Brinkley does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of amended claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-8, 10-11, 13-14, and 19 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite.

With respect to claim 20, for the same reason as discussed with respect to claim 1, Brinkley does not disclose or suggest “the PCMCIA card is capable of being plugged into an Aircraft Condition Monitoring System (ACMS) using an existing card interface, the ACMS generating an ACMS report after one or more exclusive conditions are fulfilled ... the CPU transmits the flight performance data stored in the memory to the wired network after the one or more exclusive conditions are fulfilled and the ACMS report is generated,” as recited in amended claim 20 (emphasis added). Accordingly, amended claim 20 is allowable.

Claims 21-30 and 32-35 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 20 and for the additional features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-11, 13-14, 19-30, and 32-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9, 12, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Brinkley.

Claims 9 and 12 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite. Claim 31 is allowable at least because it depends from allowable claim 20 and for the additional features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 12, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

As discussed during the Interview, claims 15-18 and 36 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 15-18 and 36 have been

rewritten in independent form. Prompt allowance of claims 15-18 and 36 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 13, 2006



Kelly T. Lee
Registration No. 47,743
Andrews Kurth LLP
1350 I Street, N.W.
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
Tel. (202) 662-2736
Fax (202) 662-2739

Attachment: Provisional Terminal Disclaimer